Answering Ibn Mardhiyah

Answering Ibn Mardhiyah

Ibn Mardhiyah is a Muslim who has taken my challenge to refute my accusations of Islam. This is what he wrote and my response to him. My original writing is in blue. Ibn Madhiyah's refutation is in black. My response to him is in red.

From:	**"Riyaz" isay@lantic.net**

Ibn Mardhiyah wrote:

In the Name of Allah, the Most Beneficient, the Most Merciful

This is a letter of advice from a Believer to a Disbeliever, and an invitation to accept Islam.

Ali Sina,

There are several glaring errors on your website FAQ page.
If you claim to be in search of truth and rationality, please edit them.

---

1)

...there was a time that all the humanity believed that the earth was flat. all philosophers and prophets concurred and the common sense confirmed it....

Did The Qur'an or Prophet Muhammad [saws] ever make this claim? Your site is all about attacking Islam and attempting to defame it. Yet you use outdated concepts from Christianity and Judaism wherever possible and try to associate them with Islam.

The notion of Earth being flat is clear from Quran and is confirmed in hadithes. The proof is here

I am not going to repeat my self. If any of your questions/refutations have been answered already, I'll only place the link.

---

2)

"...the prophet exterminated the jews of arabia..."This is incorrect. He did not exterminate them, and even the Jews themselves will tell you this. The Jews in Arabia were fought against after they had violated their treaties and behaved treacherously. Thus the Prophet Muhammad made war against them. When they were defeated, many of them chose voluntarily to leave Arabia with their posessions.

To learn how Muhammad massacred the Jews and ethnically cleansed the Hijaz from the Jews and the Christians see this link.

---

3)

"...my criticism is about all the religions. the very concept of god sending messengers to be known and worshipped is absurd. all those who come pretending to bring a message from an invisible god that only they can see..."

Why is this absurd? Who out of any of the Prophets ever claimed to have seen God? Do you have any proof for this accusation of yours?

This subject is covered in detail see this link

---

4)

****"...self-appointed prophets..."****

Which out of the Prophets were self-appointed? They asked for nothing. Not power, not fame, not money, not land, nothing, except that the people stay away from evil and vice, and to believe in One God alone. If you call these most honorable men that have ever existed on the face of this earth, if you are calling them "self-appointed", then who is not "self-appointed"?

What was the proof of these messengers except their own words? Their own word is not enough. Every year hundreds of charlatans claim to be prophets and have no other proof except their own words. It would be foolish to accept them just because they say so.

You say they asked nothing. I don't understand what do you mean by that. These self proclaimed prophets are narcissists. What they want is recognition, respect and power. Their whole purpose of life is this and being a messenger of an almighty deity provides them unlimited narcissistic supply. See Here to learn about narcissism.

---

5)

"...the prophet himself used to invoke the curse of allah on his enemies, sometimes for 30 consecutive days...."

You failed to mention that these enemies who were cursed for such a long time were the people who asked the Prophet to send to them learned Muslims who could teach them Islam. The 70 missionaries that were sent to that tribe were treacherously massacred at Bir Ma'unah. by the same tribe that asked for them. If someone massacred your loved ones, would you love them or hate them? You would curse them too, as would anyone else.

1. The story as reported by you is inaccurate. But that is beside the point. My objection is that it is not behooving for a messenger of God to curse anyone even his enemies. This vindictive spirit pertains to people with no spiritual insight. A man who calls himself the messenger of the merciful God should not comport in such low and shameful manner. He should set the standard of morality, magnanimity and greatness. What he did was foolish and childish. No wonder the Islamic world following the examples of such low character have sunk so deep.
2. The next point is that if really God is displeased from anyone can't he punish him? Does he need one of his creatures tell him what to do? Doesn't this demonstrate Muhammad's arrogance? If there is an injustice done, shouldn't God be the judge? Who are we to tell God what are his duties? By invoking evil upon his enemies Muhammad not only demonstrated to be a vindictive man with little moral fortitude but also an arrogant person who thought it is up to him to tell God how to run his business.
3. Apart from all that, Muhammad's lack of understanding becomes evident from the very fact that he believed curses have any effect. If curse had any effect why he went into war with his opponent? Why he did not stop at cursing them and wait until God to take care of them? Why non of his enemies suffered any harm until he actually went and destroyed them physically? If cursing had any effect why the one billion Muslims who constantly curse the Jews for 1400 years have not been able to win the small nation of Israel? Believing in curse is stupid. How can an intelligent person believe that curse has any effect?

---

6)

"...please tell us how do you justify the prophet bursting into ka'ba and destroying the idols of the people who believed in them?..."

It was absolutely justified. Earlier you denigrated the Prophets as being "charlatans" and "self-appointed", yet you conveniently forget that the Holy Ka'bah was built by Prophet Ibrahim and his son, for the worship of One God. Later on, the people fell into disbelief, and began to believe in stone idols that could not help their own selves, much less help any human being. Prophet Muhammad only restored the Ka'bah to what it was originally built for.

1. The story of Ka'bah being built by Abraham is a myth. It is an improbable legend.
2. The early Jews were not monotheists and so Abraham. Monotheism evolved thousands of years later. See these two articles The Origin of God and the evolution of Monotheism.
3. Even if what you say is right, the Ka'bah belonged to the people who lived in Mecca and they had their religion. Even if that religion was not the same as taught by Abraham it was not Muhammad's business to go and destroy their gods and desecrate their temple. Muhammad had no respect for people's belief. He set the example and later the Muslims kept destroying all the sacred places of the countries where they conquered. In Iran they burned the Zoroastrian temples, in India the Hindu and Buddhist temples and so on. Omar even burned all the books in the biggest library of the world in Gondi Shapoor. When the Muslims informed him of the library and asked what they should do with that many books, his response was: "If what is in those books is against the Quran, then they must be burned. But if they are not then they are redundant because Quran has all the knowledge that world needs to know." So he ordered burning all the books.

This cult of Islam never had any respect for anyone's religion, culture or identity. Now the Islamists come to the West and demand to be respected, their religion be recognized and ask for equal rights. Why no Islamic country gives the non Muslims the same rights that it grants to its Muslim citizens? But when they come in the Land of the Kafirs they want to be treated equally. Isn't that hypocracy? Don't tell me this is something Muslims have misunderstood from the teachings of Quran and the Sunnah of the Prophet. Muhammad called the unbelievers Najis, 9: 28 He asked the Muslims to fight with them 9: 29, slay them wherever they find them 9: 5, 2:19, Murder them and show them harshness 9:123 , and do not befriend them even if they are their fathers and brothers 9: 23.

Islam is a religion of hate, of intolerance and of violation of all human rights. Do you need more proof?

Your rhetorical raving against the Qur'an is not original, and many have come before you who did a much better job at trying to defame the Qur'an, but just like them, you too have failed.

All those freethinkers before me proved the fallacy of Quran and did a great job. No Muslim has ever been able to answer them. The only response they got was imprisonment or execution. This does not prove the truth of Quran, it just proves that Islam is a terrorist cult that knows one thing and that is killing.

It is simple enough to see that any book written by man will be changed. Man does not have the power, either in the past, now, or even in the future to write a book, on any subject, and then guard it from any change throughout his life and after death. Writers who author books and novels constantly revise their own stuff before and after publishing. But the Qur'an is a Divine Book, and Allah has made it known that He will preserve it, and so we see that for the

past 1400 years, the Qur'an has been preserved. All 114 chapters, letter for letter. No man-made book is capable of such minute protection against change.

As for Quran not being changed, I suppose you should read this article. The Perversion of the Qur'an and the Loss of Many Parts of It

Nevertheless, this is not the proof of the divine origin of Quran. Quran is full of logical, scientific, historic and grammatical errors. That is why I reject it as a divine book. The Republics of Plato predates Quran by 1100 years and the books of Confucius, Laoze, and Juangze are also as much old. They are also not changed. But no one claims that because of that they are divine books.

---

7)

The following illustrates your extreme narrow mindedness and ignorance:
You said:

"...only words i know for a person who massacres his prisoners of war indiscriminately is a criminal and a mass murderer...."

Please state which instances you are referring to. If you are referring to those prisioners that were taken from the Quraish and then executed, then you should know that those prisoners were criminals and oppressors. Some of the prisoners from many battles were spared and treted very well, even better than the Muslims treated themselves. Some were let go after teaching a certain number of Muslim children how to read and write. Those who were killed were those who were guilty of spreading hatred and injustice, and thus leaving them alive was not an option. It is absolutely irrational that a known criminal and murderer, if captured should be released wthout having paid for his or her crimes.

If you are referring to the Jewish male prisoners of war who were beheaded, then you should know that they were guilty of treachery, and that they knew from their own book, the Torah, that under such treacherous behavior, the punishment was death by beheading. The male prisoners of war willingly chose this fate from their own Book. The females and children were not killed. Your claim that Prophet Muhammad was a mass murderer and a criminal is unjustified.

I refer to all Muhammad's murders. Let us take the example of the Jews and in particular the Bani Qurayza.

Obviously this tribe was annihilated, the record we have of them is the history written by the victor. The history written by the victor is highly biased. He would never mention his crimes and brutalities, he would justify his action with pretense that the other party broke the treaty or taunted him so much that he was left no other option but to act. Nadir Shah for Iranians is considered to be a great king. We were taught that the Indians bothered him so much that he was left no other option but attack India. The version of the history that was fed to us

claimed that the defeated people of India were very “pleased” of him. That he was so just that he cut in two pieces few Iranian soldiers who had used the services of some whores and did not pay for it and hang their chopped bodies at the gates of the city. I have not read yet the true story written by the Indians, but it seemed to me very unlikely that any nation be happy to be conquered by a foreign army, even when I was just a school kid. Yet Iranians are unwilling to teach to their children the truth that they too had their share of barbarity, cruelty and injustice.

We can never learn about the truth of what happened in Medina to the Jews. But even by examining the very biased story written by the Muslims it becomes clear that it was Muhammad who broke the treaty with the Jews and not the other way round. See the story of the Jews of Medina

Now let us assume that actually it was the Banu Qurayza what broke the treaty. Would this justify Muhammad massacring all of them and selling as slaves their women and children? This mentality is extremely troublesome. Usually the people who decide on behalf of a nation are their leaders, if the leaders do something wrong, should the entire population be punished? Milosovic is a war criminal, does that allow us to go and massacre the entire Yugoslav population? Saddam Hussein is a criminal too; should we massacre all the Iraqis, enslave their wives and children?

When Banu Quraiza was besieged by Muhammad’s men the army of Allah shut the water supply to them. Imagine the hardship that the children had to go through. Finally they decided to surrender. No fight ever took place. Now they are prisoners of war. What would the merciful messenger of Allah do to his prisoners of war? He would order the massacre of all the men and enslavement of all the woman and children. To separate men from the boys he ordered the youngsters to take off their pants for him to inspect and see if they had grown any pubic hair. If they had he ordered killing them, if not he sold them to serve as slaves. Is growing pubic hair a crime punishable by death? What was the guilt of a 12-year old boy who just happened to have grown pubic hair?

> Narrated Atiyyah al-Qurazi:
> I was among the captives of Banu Qurayzah. They (the Companions) examined us, and those who had begun to grow hair (pubes) were killed, and those who had not were not killed. I was among those who had not grown hair.Sunan Abu-Dawud Book 38, Number 4390

What kind of human worthy of calling himself with such a name can read these heinous acts and still defend one of the most brutal criminals this world has ever seen?

"The truths of religion are never so well understood as by those who have lost the power of reasoning."...Voltaire, Philosophical Dictionary, 1764

The fact of the genocide of the Jews and the Christians ordered by Muhammad is clear from this Hadith .

> The Prophet on his death-bed, gave three orders one of them was to Expel the pagans from the Arabian Peninsula. Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 288

Go ahead and deny the authenticity of this hadith. It is classified as Sahis but you are a Muslims and lying in defense of Islam is good.

And the fact the Muhammad enslaved free people is clear from this hadith.

> Sa'd's (the man chosen by the Prophet to decide the fate of the Bani Quriaza) verdict was "that all the able-bodied male persons belonging to the tribe should be killed, women and children taken prisoners and their wealth divided among the Muslim fighters." Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 280

What does "take their women and children as prisoners" mean. What did those women and children do? What was the purpose of keeping them as prisoners? They became slaves to the captors and since no Muslim fought in this war, they all went to the estate of the Prophet and he sold them. He kept Rayhana for his own sexual pleasures.

The fact that this war enriched Muhammad is also clear from the following hadith.

> Narrated Anas bin Malik:
> People used to give some of their datepalms to the Prophet (as a gift), till he conquered Bani Quraiza and Bani An-Nadir, whereupon he started returning their favors. Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 176

Now I hope there is a grain of humanity in you and you come to your senses and stop worshiping a devilish cult.

---

8)

"...only words i know for someone who at the age of 53 becomes aroused by a 9-year-old child is pedophile...."

It is well known that Aishah, the Mother of the Believers, was as fully mature as any 20 year old is nowadays at the time of consumnation. You assume that she looked like the average nine year old of today. She and her type of arabian girls were most certainly not like the nine year old girls of today. It is a fact that people in arabia, 1400 years ago were physically larger on average than humans of today. This is something archaeologists know for a fact, that people of the past, especially those of ARabia, were physically larger and matured faster than the humans of today. Your claim that Prophet Muhammad was a pedophile is invalid.

That is an absurdity. The human race has not gone through such mutation is just 1400 years. This is the most ridiculous statement I ever heard on this subject. Ayesha claimed that her mother came and took her to Muhammad when she was playing on a swing Sahih Bukhari 5.234 She also said that she used to play with her dolls with her girlfriends and the

Prophet used to sit and play with her. Sahih Bukhari V 8, B 73, N151 How many 20 year old women you know who play on swing and with their dolls?

You think that if you call a lie "fact" it become a fact. It just demonstrates how little you know of science and how religion has destroyed your rational thinning. You don't even know that archaeology has nothing to do with this matter. This is a question of biology and evolution. And what you say is scientific heresy. It just proves that Marx was right when he said that religion is the opium of the masses and that your brain is on religion.

For more on Ayesha's age read here

Some Muslims have decided that it is too embarrassing to admit that their prophet wobbled in the bed with a 9 year old child and now claim that she was 18 years old. See their argument and the rebuttal of that claim here

See also this link for some moral evaluation of Muhammad's pedophilea.

---

9)
"...only word i know that describes a person who raids merchant caravans and steals their goods is highway robber...."

You failed to make mention that there was a state of war existing between the Muslims and the non-muslims. Muslims were taking back what was theirs, because when the Muslims fled Makkah after increased persecution, they did not take their belongings and valuables with them. All their property and finance was stolen by the non-muslims. Furthermore, during times of peace, like after the Treaty of Hudaibiyah, no caravans were robbed. If Prophet Muhammad really was a highway robber as you insist, then he would have continued to rob caravans even during times of peace.

Muhammad started raiding the caravans before any state of war existed. See the proof here.

Muslims were a marauding gang. It is a lie that the early Muslims were "taking back" what they had lost. No one confiscated anything from the Muslims in Mecca. No one forced them to leave Mecca. In fact the families of most of these converts tried to prevent their young relatives who had fallen prey to this new cult of Islam from leaving. It was Muhammad who forced them to emigrate. I have shown this very clearly in my response to Ayatollah Montazeri. . (More proof that Muhammad radied innocent people without warning killing their men and taking their wives and children as slaves is below.)

Now let us suppose that actually some Meccans did confiscate the belonging of the Muslims (This is not true at all. See the above link) under what law one can go and take possession of the belongings of another person that happens to be a citizen of the same town? If some

Muslims steal something from me, is is right for me to come and take your property in revenge?

For the sake of heaven. When I talk with you Muslims I have to lower my self and explain such foolish things as if I am talking with a child in kinder garden.

---

10)
"...only word that i know for someone who captures human beings and sells them or asks for ransom to release them is a slave merchant and a terrorist..."

No humans were sold into slavery. Such behavior that you accuse Prophet Muhammad of is impossible, seeing that he came to abolish slavery. Prisoners of war that were captured were returned upon payment of ransom. This is no different than common criminals today being held in jails only to be released on a set payment of a fine or a bail amount. While in custody, those prisoners of war were treated very well, an Islamic practice that continues even today, like for example in Chechnya, where Russian soldiers themselves testify to the excellent treatment they recieve at the hands of their Muslim captors. If Prophet Muhammad indeed was a slave merchant as you accuse, then he would not have cared for the rights of those prisoners and would have physically abused them while they were in his custody. Nor did he terrorise anyone. The DIsbelievers from Makkah, who came to pay the ransom amounts knew Muhammad to be an honest and trustworthy person, even though they hated him. They knew full well that any prisoners under his command would not be safe, and not abused or terrorized. Thus your accusation of Prophet Muhammad being a slave merchant and a terrorist is rejected by all rational-thinking people.

I already quoted the hadith were Muhammad enslaved the women and children of banu Quriaza. Then he moved to Kheibar and did the same in that town.

Sahih Bukhari V 2, B 14, N68

> Narrated Anas bin Malik:
>
> Allah's Apostle (p.b.u.h) offered the Fajr prayer when it was still dark, then he rode and said, 'Allah Akbar! Khaibar is ruined. When we approach near to a nation, the most unfortunate is the morning of those who have been warned." The people came out into the streets saying, "Muhammad and his army." Allah's Apostle vanquished them by force and their warriors were killed; **the children and women were taken as captives**. Safiya was taken by Dihya Al-Kalbi and later she belonged to Allah's Apostle go who married her and her Mahr was her manumission.

As a matter of fact Muhammad had so many slaves that only Ayesha who was just one of his many wives manumitted 40 of them in one occasion when she broke an oath as expiation. Now one can just imagine how many slaves did she actually have and how many

slaves Muhammad's other wives had. Where did they get these slaves, except through capturing them is several wars? (Sahih Bukhari V 4, B 56, N708)

Well you were shocked that Muhammad had any slaves and said it is "impossible". Now you know the truth. Are you still going to defend that man?

You said:

Prisoners of war that were captured were returned upon payment of ransom. This is no different than common criminals today being held in jails only to be released on a set payment of a fine or a bail amount

The difference is that those captured were women and children and not "common criminals". Plus you forget that Muhammad already confiscated their properties. How they could pay any ransom. There is not a single place where reports such release ever took place. Those people who were released by ransom were Arab men captured after Muhammad raided their merchant caravans stole their goods and then asked for ransom from their families or threatened to kill them. Read the treachery of Muhammad's men in the highway rubbery at Nakhlah The fact that you say while in custody the prisoners were treated very well makes me believe you have very little knowledge of the history of Islam. Muhammad kept his prisoners under the threat of death until he got money for their release. These men were captured in raids. This is what we call kidnapping or sequester. It is a shame that someone defend such crime in this day and age. I am afraid you are a brainwashed man who cannot distinguish between right and wrong any more. Muslims do not treat well their captives. Muhammad did not treat well his captives. The very taking act of raiding them and capturing them was illegal. He infringed their human rights just by raiding these caravans or towns, plundering their belongings and capturing them. This man was a gangster not a human let alone a messenger of God. Who brainwashed one can be not to see that?

You also wrote:

If Prophet Muhammad indeed was a slave merchant as you accuse, then he would not have cared for the rights of those prisoners and would have physically abused them while they were in his custody.

Actually the two things are not related. He got these people by raiding their homes and sold them for profit. However there is indication that he also considered beating them is okay. In Hadith Sahih Bukhari V 8, B 73, N 68 He advised his followers not to beat their wives like a stallion or a slave and then sleep with them.

In the Hadith Sahih Bukhari V 2, B 25, N 587 Muhammad orders "every male or female, free man or slave, the payment of one Sa' of dates or barley as Sadaqat-ul-Fitr" This shows also that slavery was accepted in Islam.

Raiding without warning, killing the men and enslaving the women had become a trademark of Muhammad. If fact the word Qazvah means sudden attack.

Sahih Bukhari V 3, B 46, N 717

> Narrated Ibn Aun:
> I wrote a letter to Nafi and Nafi wrote in reply to my letter that the Prophet had **suddenly attacked** Bani Mustaliq **without warning** while they were heedless and their cattle were being watered at the places of water. **Their fighting men were killed and their women and children were taken as captives;** the Prophet got Juwairiya on that day. Nafi said that Ibn 'Umar had told him the above narration and that Ibn 'Umar was in that army.

I honestly believe any person who reads these stories of treachery, cowardliness and barbarity and still believes Muhammad was a messenger of God he is a subhuman, a brainless zombie not deserving to be called human.

---

11)
"...only words that i know for someone who forces himself on a captured woman in the same day that he kills her father, husband and many of her relatives is a rapist,..."

You must be referring to Safiyyah bint Huyyay. She was a Jewess from the conquered Jewish fortress of Khaybar. She herself had a dream that she would be married to Prophet Muhammad. Her husband was executed on account of his treachery and betrayal. This was according to his own Jewish law which rewarrds treachery and betrayal with execution. Safiyyah was given a choice to freely return to her people or to accept Islam and become the wife of Prophet Muhammad. Her words were: "I choose Allah and His Messenger.", and so she became Muslim and of her own free will, married Prophet Muhammad.There is no record of rape or force. Prophet Muhammad would often marry women from other tribes in order to strengthen diplomatic bonds between two groups of people, the Muslims and the new group in question. Similar was the case of the defeated Jews of Khaybar who had a Jewess from amongst them become the wife of the Prophet Muhammad.Show your proof of this accusation of rapist if you are truthful. Rape is defined in the Websters Dictionary, Second College Edition as:

"the crime of having sexual intercourse with a woman or girl forcibly and without her consent."

Produce any proof you have that the Prophet Muhammad raped Safiyyah, or for that matter, raped any woman. If you cannot then your claim that he was a rapist is ridiculous and untrue.

The shameful story of the rape of Safiyah is discussed at length in this page.

The following story gives a better idea of the dirty mind of this man you call a messenger of God.

Bukhari Volume 7, Book 63, Number 182:

Narrated Abu Usaid
We went out with the Prophet to a garden called Ash-Shaut till we reache d two walls between which we sat down. The Prophet said, "Sit here," and went in (the garden). The Jauniyya (a lady from Bani Jaun) had been brought and lodged in a house in a date-palm garden in the home of Umaima bint An-Nu'man bin Sharahil, and her wet nurse was with her. **When the Prophet entered upon her, he said to her, "Give me yourself as a gift." She said, "Can a princess give herself in marriage to an ordinary man?" The Prophet raised his hand to pat her so that she might become tranquil.** She said, "I seek refuge with Allah from you." He said, "You have sought refuge with One Who gives refuge. Then the Prophet came out to us and said, "O Abu Usaid! Give her two white linen dresses to wear and let her go back to her family.

It was a tradition of the Arabs to sleep with any women who consented. There was no need of any ceremony and no money was exchanged. This was called Habbah. There is a tradition that a woman offered herself to Abdullah Muhammad's father who did not accept then and went to Amina and conceived her. Then he went back to that woman and told her that he is ready to sleep with her. The woman refused and said when I saw you before the was a light with you but that light is now gone.

This hadith is obviously forged by Muslims to give a miraculous aura to Muhammad's conception. However, the very existence of such tradition shows that sleeping with women without marriage was a custom of the Arabs.

Muhammad slept with few women who offered themselves to him. Since there was no contract signed, no Mahr (dowry) was required and there was no obligation on the part of the man to keep that woman. But often poor women who offered themselves as habbah because in return they received food and sometimes shelter. However, wealthy women never gave themselves as the "gift" and this impertinence of Muhammad in the above case was shear arrogance.

---

12)
"...only word that i know that describes a person who sends his men to kill his opponents in the middle of the night traitorously is an assassin..."

Assassination is described in Webster's as killing of a politically important person. First of all, it was the Blessed Companions of Prophet Muhammad who offered to kill the apostates and those who were spreading trouble in the land. Second, these people who were killed were not politically important. Thirdly, such people who do spread such terror and hate and lies like Aswad most certainly deseved to be killed. Any rationally thinking person will arrive at this conclusion after viewing all other ways to achieve a certain goal to make a trouble-maker desist from his activities. And last but not least, their was no betrayal. No traitors. Your claim that he was a traitorous assassin is rejected.

The following are some of the people Muhammad assassinated.

Ka`b bin al-Ashraf
Sallam Ibn Abu'l-Huqayq (Abu Rafi)
Al-Nadr bin al-Harith
Uqba bin Abi Muayt
Abdullah bin Ubai bin Salul al-Aufi
Umaiya bin Khalaf Abi Safwan
`Amr b. Jihash
An anonymous man
Ibn Sunayna
Abd Allah Ibn Sa`d Ibn Abi Sarh
Abu `Afak
`Asma' Bint Marwan

I am afraid you must have lost either your brain or your humanity for not being shocked over the fact that Muhammad sent murderers to eliminate his opponents in the middle for the night. Those "blessed companions" were murderers. They acted like any gangster. It is no wonder that Muslims are terrorists. They do as their prophet did. What would you say if non-Muslims dealt with Muslims the way Muhammad and his "blessed companions" dealt with their opponents. You Muslims are offended even is someone write a true article about your religion and yet your prophet used to send assassins to terror this opponents in the middle of the night al mafioso. Read the story of Abu Afak. He was a very old man. His crime was to compose a poetry satirical of Muhammad. Assma Bint Marwan was also a poetess, mother of five very small children. Her crime was also having written a poetry cursing the men of Medina who did not have the courage to stand against Muhammad's chain killings.

Do you really believe a murderer can show you the right path? You can be sure that he is taking you to hell.

Second, these people who were killed were not politically important.

These people were humans. Shame on you for having sank so deep. You are no more a human.

Thirdly, such people who do spread such terror and hate and lies like Aswad most certainly deseved to be killed.

And you are offended when we say Islam is a terrorist cult? Islam only can maintain itself by terror. But those days are over. I use my pen to kill this beast. My pen is my weapon and it is mightier than Muhammad's sword. Muhammad needed to kill and terror his opponents because he could not win by logic. You brainwashed followers of that murderer have maintained that tradition of terror until now. But it is over. Now with the help of my old PC and the Internet I am going to destroy your empire of terror. The sun of reason had dawned and the creatures of darkness like you will have no where to hide. Islam can maintain itself only through ignorance and terror. Now with the Internet you can do neither.

Any rationally thinking person will arrive at this conclusion after viewing all other ways to achieve a certain goal to make a trouble-maker desist from his activities.

I am so pleased that you wrote and shamelessly described what a Muslim means when he talks about "rational thinking". The rationality of a person who is a devil worshipper cannot be more rational than this.

---

13)

"...but if muslims are offended for they believe what i say is false then they have to prove it to me that these stories are all baseless..."

Excellent. I see that you have rationally left the door open for refutation, and that you do accept that your statements may be false, and you have asked for proof. Done.

Not so fast cowboy!

Yes I left the door of refutation and will keep it open. But you did not prove but the fact that Islam is a murderous cult, that it rears brainwashed killers. That the world will not have peace until and unless Islam is completely eradicated. This is what you proved.

---

14)

"...we have to compare the teachings of these religions to the modern humanistic concepts of equality and oneness of humankinds..."

I ask you: What is your rationale by setting "modern humanistic concepts" as the de facto standard for judging other ways of life? Modern humanistic concepts states that adultery is acceptable, that oppression in the name of "national security" is acceptable, that homosexuality is acceptable, that taking away the hard-earned money from people via interest is ok, that all criminals deserve to live no matter how evil their crimes, that enslavement of people and stripping them of their freedom in the name of corporate expansion and "national security" is ok...all these are modern humanist values.

Humanistic values drive from the Golden Rule. This is an infallible measure of right and wrong. Do not do to others what you do not expect other do to you. From this rule we can get all the guidance we need to lead a harmonious life with other human beings.

Modern Humanistic values do not teach adultery. This is pure ignorance. I have an article where I spoke in detail about morality It dissipates many misconceptions regarding religion being the source of morality. As a matter of fact I show why religious morality is outdated and immoral according to today's standards. The above example of Muhammad asking a woman

to give herself to him as a gift was not an immoral act in his time, it is very immoral now. The fact that he slept with a 9 year old child was not immoral then, but it is now.

In nowhere the humanist say that "oppression in the name of national security is acceptable". Humanism hold the United Nation Charter of Human Rights as the standard of right and wrong. Oppression under no pretext is acceptable by any humanist. However, Oppression in the name of Islam is acceptable. When Muhammad orders

Muslims to kill the disbelievers wherever they find them (Q. 2:191) this is oppression. When he asks them to murder them and treat them harshly (Q. 9:123) or slay them (Q. 9: 5) and fight with them, (Q. 8: 65) just because they want to have the freedom of belief this is oppression. When he asks the Jews and Christians to accept Islam or pay Jaziyah feeling subdued and humiliated (Q. 9: 29) and taxes them up to 50% of their income as he did in Kheibar, this is oppression. When Quran takes away the freedom of belief from all humanity and tell clearly that no other religion except Islam will be accepted (Q. 3: 85) this is oppression. When he call the non-believers najis (impure untouchable) (Q. 9: 28) and says they will go to hell (Q. 5: 11), this is oppression. When Muhammad orders his followers to fight the unbelievers until no other religion except Islam is left (Q. 2: 193), it is oppression. When it causes hate of the non-Muslims by telling stupid stories that they will go to hell and will drink boiling water (Q. 14: 17) this is oppression. When he asks the Muslims to slay or crucify or cut the hands and feet of the unbelievers, that they be expelled from the land with disgrace and that “they shall have a great punishment in world hereafter” (Q.5: 34) this is oppression. When he uses fear mongering by tales like “As for the disbelievers for them garments of fire shall be cut and there shall be poured over their heads boiling water whereby whatever is in their bowls and skin shall be dissolved and they will be punished with hooked iron rods” (Q. 22: 9) this is oppression. When Quran prohibits a Muslim to befriend a non-believer even if that non-believer is the father or the brother of that Muslim (Q. 9: 23), (Q. 3: 28), this is oppression. When it asks the Muslims to “strive against the unbelievers with great endeavor (Q. 25: 52), be stern with them because they belong to hell (Q. 66: 9) this is oppression. When Muhammad demands his follower to “strike off the heads of the disbelievers”; then after making a “wide slaughter among them, carefully tie up the remaining captives” (Q. 47: 4) this is oppression. When he says women are inferior to men and they are deficient in intelligence, and their husbands have the right to scourge them if they are found disobedient (Q. 4:34) this is oppression. When he says that women will go to hell if they are disobedient to their husbands (Q. 66:10) and maintains that men have an advantage over the women (Q. 2:228), it is oppression. when he denies the women's equal right to their inheritance (Q. 4:11-12), and regards them as imbeciles and decrees that their witness is not admissible in the court (Q. 2:282) this is oppression. This means that a woman who is raped cannot accuse her rapist unless she can produce a male witness. Polygamy and polyamory with the slave grills and women captured in wars (Q. 4:3) is rape and oppression. The whole Islam is oppression.

that homosexuality is acceptable,
Humanism does not promote homosexuality. It simply conceders homosexuality a private

matter and not the business of the state to kill the homosexuals. Some people consider homosexuality a moral issue, others say it is a biological issue. Whatever it is and what people do in the privacy of their bedroom should not be the concern of the society. What should be the concern of the society is that no one infringe the rights of another human being by imposing on him a religion that he does not want to believe, by forcing her a dress code that she does not want to wear, by telling him what to eat, how to dress, how to pray, who to pray to etc. These are private matters and the humanistic laws are there to protect them as our indelible right.

that taking away the hard-earned money from people via interest is ok,
Interest on loaned money is okay because no society will ever advance without it. All the Islamic countries have adopted it and practice it. If there is no interest no one would lend money to another person and the person who has the idea and capability but no money can never get the capital that he needs to start a business. He will remain poor and many jobs that he could have created will not be created, many mouths that could have been fed with those jobs will not be fed. The person who has the money will keep his money under his mattress and will not be able to add to it. This primitive mandate of Islam makes sure that every one remains poor and the society never advances.

But in a society that interests on the loans are charged, (basically everywhere in the world including all Islamic countries) people who have ideas and talent can borrow from those who have money but cannot put it to work, These entrepreneurs can generate wealth for themselves, for many people that their enterprise employs and for those who have lent them the capital. All of them pay taxes and the whole society benefits because roads, schools hospitals and all the social benefits can be financed by that tax money. This is a win/win/win/win situation. Everybody wins. Following the stupid rules of Islam everybody loses. Another proof that Islam is outdated and useless.

that all criminals deserve to live no matter how evil their crimes,
There are countries like USA that though have incorporated a lot of humanistic values in their laws have death penalties for their worst criminals. Other counties like Canada have eliminated it. This is a matter of choice. Both religious and non religious people are divided on this issue. My personal view is that it is better not to kill the criminals because sometime (and unfortunately more often than we like) errors happen and innocent people are executed wrongly. And a life in prison is more painful than death. So if he is a criminal why end his misery so soon?

that enslavement of people and stripping them of their freedom in the name of corporate expansion and "national security" is ok

This is certainly an absurdity. No humanist ever accepts such thing. You don't know what you are talking about. However as I showed above Muhammad practiced real slavery and slavery is still being practiced in Sudan by Muslims and in Saudi Arabia where young girls from poor Islamic counters like Pakistan and Bangladesh are purchased for domestic work and the pleasure of the filthy Arab sheikhs.

The correct way to approach any way of life, be it any religion or any modern humanistical and secular system, is to judge concepts present in them by referring them to the judgments of an un-biased authority. Such an authority cannot be human, because humans are capable of mistakes, neglect, and forgetfulness. In Arabic, the word for human is "insaan", meaning the one who forgets. The root word is "nisayn" which means forgetfulness. Thus we cannot use any human or group of humans to be the judge. This leaves only that which Created humans and all that exists, namely, God.

The root word of "insan" is not "nisan". insan drives from "ons", which means affection or being gregarious.

Your argument that humans cannot be the judge for their own laws and have to leave that to a deity that no one has seen except a charlatan who claimed to have received his messages is very flawed. First of all you have to prove that such god exist. Although I believe in a Single Principle underlying the creation, I do not believe in the god depicted my Muhammad, Jesus or other impostors. The very existence of such god is a logical impossibility and the proof is overwhelming. I challenge anyone to disprove me.

This article explains the logical difficulty of the god of the monotheistic religions

This one answers the question of chance or intelligence or in other words creation or evolution.

And this one explains my concept of Life Beyond and the Single Principle

Your second challenge is to prove how a pervert man like Muhammad who as I have demonstrated throughout all the pages of this site was one of the most vile creatures could be the messenger of that god.

God has made it clear what is acceptable and what is not. You may ask, how do you know it was God who decided such? I tell you once again, that the Qur'an is a Book devoid of any mistakes or discrepancies or any change since its completion. Such a state of existence is a miracle, a supernatural act that can only be committed by an entity that has the power eternal to do so, and such an entity is God. We Muslims know for a fact that God has differentiated what is right and what is wrong, what is justice and what is opression.

Here obviously you are babbling tautologically without making any logical sense.

a) Quran is changed and even if it hasn't this is no proof that it is from God. There are many books that predate Quran and are not changed. This is an absurd proposition that you assume that Quran is not chanegd and then conclude that it must be from God. The fact that a book has not changed and its divine origin has no correlation. Here your thesis (Quran is not changed), your antithesis (a book that does not change is from God) and your synthesis (Since it is not changed it must be from God) are all wrong.

b) Quran is full of errors. Here is just 10 of them. For more proofs see below.

"We Muslims know for a fact that God has differentiated what is right and what is wrong, what is justice and what is opression."

Obviously you Muslims cannot differentiate between facts and illusions. What fact? Every sentence in Quran contains two mistakes. You are just fooling yourselves. Read the above link and those given below and see how ridiculous is that statement of yours.

It looks like you have no clue about justice too. Islam is a cult of tyranny and oppression as I demonstrated above with verses from Quran. And that was just a sample.

"Humanist" values that you are advocating are subject to error and change. They are limited in view and narrow in approach, with no foresight. In contrast, Islam is based of unchangeable divine justice and the Believers have no doubt of the singular validity of Islam and only Islam.

The humanistic values are based on the Golden Rule, though nothing is absolute we can be very safe if we follow this rule. The very fact that the rules change is a positive thing because laws must be at the service of humanity and not vice versa. The society is constantly changes and so should it laws. The so called divine laws are not divine at all but are made by a maniac who lived eons ago. Those rules are not practical anymore. Many of them are inhumane and oppressive but above all those so called divine rules puts men at the service of the rules which is completely contrary to the very purpose of law that must serve the society and ease the life of the people. There is nothing more dangerous than having a fallible manmade law and believing that it is infallible and divine.

Humanistic laws are made by people, everyone can criticize them, suggest alternatives and improvements. Religious laws are cast is stone, no one can oppose them without suffering the consequences or even lose his or her life. Human society is changing constantly, the laws that were good a hundred years ago are no more applicable. Trying to impose the laws of a 7th century primitive society in the 21st century were the world has changed so much that every human being can communicate and interact with everyone else throughout the globe is anachronistic and anti progressive. No wonder Islamic countries are so backward. The very fact that Islam is based on unchangeable laws makes Islam obsolete and unpractical. Laws are made for the well being of humans not vice versa. The human society is alive evolving and progressing and so it laws must keep with the times. Religious laws are dead fossils. The fact that they cannot change renders them useless. Take the example of traffic by-law, one hundred years ago the traffic was the traffic of horses and carriages. Can we use the same traffic by-laws of a century ago in the metropolis of today?

Believers have no doubt of the singular validity of Islam and only Islam.

Believers can believe in whatever they wish, that does not make their belief true nor give them the right to impose it on those who do not believe. Muslims are not the only group who believe that their belief is the only true belief. Virtually every believer in the world believes

that his or her religion is the true one. That does not give them license to try to impose their belief on others. We the humanists say, keep your beliefs to yourself, practice it in the privacy of your homes, but in the society we follow the rules defined in the charter of Human Rights and respect the life, the rights, the freedom of faith, and the freedom of expression of every human being irrespective of his or her beliefs.

---

15)"...the reason i fight islam is because it is a doctrine of hate..."**
You have yet to prove that Islam is a doctrine of hate. What you have succeeded in proven is your own malice, hatred and bigotry towards Islam.

I believe I did prove that Islam is a doctrine of hate and proved my case by many verses from Quran. For more you can keep reading my articles and see for your self.

Islam is a way of life based on real justice.

Obviously you don't know the meaning of this word.

Because you are incapable to see the injustice in the teachings of Islam, imagine that these teachings belong to anther religion which has gained power by killing and looting and the prophet of that religion has ordered his followers to kill the Muslims until they accept him, force them to pay a penalty tax, kill anyone of their people who decides to apostatize and become a Muslim, kill any Muslim man who marry one of their women, call Muslims najis and deprive them of their civil rights in their own countries, etc, etc.

You Muslim are true hypocrites. Here is the proof.

You try to convert people from all the religions to Islam but if someone decides to leave Islam he is an apostate and his execution becomes necessary.

You allow yourselves to marry women from any religion, but if a non-Muslim marry a Muslim woman you want to kill both of them.

You seek freedom to practice your religion, build mosques and have equal rights in any non-Muslim country, but the non-Muslims is Islamic countries are called zimmi and according to Quran they must pay a penalty tax called Jazyeh.

You seek equality in non-Muslim countries but all non-Muslims in Islamic countries are second class citizens.

In the West you seek the protection of the humanistic laws that give all people freedom but your true intention is to make Islam the religion of the land and uproot those very humanistic laws and deny everyone else the equality.

And you call this "true justice"!

Islam recognizes that some humans will be rebellious and seek to cause dissent and strife amongst humans for personal or other reasons. Islam recognizes that such people must be dealt with lest their mischief and trouble cause great trouble on Earth. If you call this hate, then you are mistaken. Hate is based on racial, ethnic, gender, or economic and societal prejudice. Islam transcends all of these barriers.

There is nothing that causes more dissent and strife amongst humans than Islam. Wherever Islam has gone it has caused dissention and strife amongst people. This tradition of causing dissent and strife dates back to the time of Muhammad himself who created hate amongst the people of Mecca, taunted the religion of the Qruaish, FORCED his followers to immigrate. Unlike the lie the he said and you keep repeating the verses of Quran prove that it was him who impelled his followers to immigrate. No one persecuted them. No Muslim died in the had of the Quraish in Mecca.

> *"Lo! those who believed and left their homes and strove with their wealth and their lives for the cause of Allah, and those who took them in and helped them: these are protecting friends one of another.* ***And those who believed but did not leave their homes, ye have no duty to protect them till they leave their homes****.."(*Q.8: 72*)*

And in another place he even orders killing those who did not immigrate.

> *They long that ye should disbelieve even as they disbelieve, that ye may be upon a level (with them).* ***So choose not friends from them till they forsake their homes in the way of Allah;*** *if they turn back (to enmity) then* ***take them and kill them wherever ye find them****, and choose no friend nor helper from among them, (Q.4: 89)*

The truth is the the Quraish did not persecute the Muslims. Muhammad wanted to divide and rule. That is why he kept taunting the religion of the Quraish to make them angry and ordered his followers to immigrate. More on this subject here

When Muhammad went to Medina, the Jews and the Arabs did not have any problems with each other. In fact they married amongst each other, made business with each other and were allies. Read the story of the Jews of Medina After Muhammad went there he caused sedition, made the Arabs hate the Jews and eventually annihilated the 2000 years old population of the Jews of Arabia pillaging all their belongings.

Muslims followed the tradition of Muhammad everywhere in the world. The partition of India and the loss of millions of lives in that subcontinent is a painful reminder of that. Today Muslims are engaged in causing sedition and terrorist activities in Philippine, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Algeria, Egypt, Turkey and have ruined the countries where they have come to power like Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Sudan, Saudi Arabia, etc.

Even United States, Canada, UK, France, Argentine and anywhere Muslims have gone has not remained immune of their terrorist activities. Muslims have brought their terrorism along with themselves in every corner of the world they have settled. Where there are two Muslims gathered together there is mischief brewing in their heads. Muslims today as they have been

in the past 1400 years are the major trouble makers and are unrelenting forces of sedition and mischief.

---

16)

"...therefore before the creation, god was not the creator...."

You are mistaken. Your alluding to Da Vinci and his creation of the Mona Lisa is not worthy. God has always been the Creator, and He has never changed or improved in any way. Your theory that God would overlap his creation was disproved over a thousand years ago by a 10 year old child who showed quite simply that in the same way nothing comes before the number zero, nothing came before God, so therefore He is not a created thing. He is the source of all creation. The 10-year old child later grew up to be known as Imam Abu Hanifa. God cannot be said to have "changed" in order to become the Creator, because this means that He is limited by Time, although Time is something which He created. God cannot be limited by his own Creation. He always was the Creator.

Here you are shooting yourself in the foot. Nothing comes before zero but zero does not have existence. Every number refers or denotes something's. Zero refers to nothing. Zero is the state of not beings. I don't have any problem considering God as a non being or as a void. In fact this constitutes my entire theory of God which contradicts the notion of God as a being who cares about this world, sends messengers, listens to prayers, punishes or rewards. God is the Single Principle underlying the creation. That has no being. God is the non being which is the mother of all beings. God is not the creator but the law of creation.

I have disproved the god of the monotheistic religions. I have shown that the creation does not need the first cause. (See chance or intelligence), but I do believe in the Life Beyond and the Single Principle and Abu Hanifa's comparison of God to Zero perfectly validates my theory and makes Allah, Yahweh or any other deity redundant.

You say you are a rational thinker yet you contradict yourself by saying God doesn't exist.

Read the above articles.

---

17)

"...these so called holy books, especially quran are full of errors. quran is replete with scientific heresies, historic blunders, mathematical mistakes, logical absurdities and grammatical errors..."

I ask you to provide a cursory example of what you accuse, if you are truthful.

Read these proofs "if YOU are truthful"

- Divinity of Quran
- Did Jesus Escape Crucifixion?
- Inheritance
- Masjidul' Aqsa
- Samaritans and Moses?
- Day of Judgment
- Predestination
- An Open Challenge to Muslims Is Earth Fixed?
- Historical Errors of the Qur'an
- Biblical Stories in Quran
- Qur'anic Language and Grammatical Mistakes
- Capricious Revelation of the Qur'an
- The Abrogator and Abrogated Qur'anic Verses
- The Contradictions of the Qur'an
- The Perversion of the Qur'an and the Loss of Many Parts of It
- The Content of the Qur'an
- Some Ordinances and Laws of the Qur'an
- Errors in the Qur'an
- Textual Corruption of the Qur'an
- What is koran And to see the absurdity of the claim that Quran is scientific check out these articles.
- Western Scientists Discovered the $cience in Quran!
- Religion vs. Modern Science
- Genesis According to Muhammad
- Embryology of Quran
- Shooting Stars, Allah's Missiles to Scare the Jins?
- Science in Quran
- Scientific Errors of the Qur'an

---

18)

"...upon the closer inspection and by using logic we can see there are may flaws in the theory of god as presented to us by these self appointed prophets. god as a being is specious and can be refuted by logics.....if god is true, it must stand the test of reason. if it doesn't, it is fanaticism..."

Let us inspect your disbelief in the existence of God by using your precious logic. Common sense, reason, rational thinking and logic all tell us that to create simple things like computers, cars, airplanes and rockets, you need people to design, manufacture and assemble the various constiuent parts of the said items. No one in his right rational-thinking mind would claim that he saw his car form all by itself out of various raw elements. No one

will claim that an airplane could form by itself or with the help of "Mother Nature". Everyone knows that cars are assembled by car companies like GM, Ford, Toyota, etc. People know that companies like Boeing or Airbus manufacture and assemble airplanes. We know it takes a team, and sometimes thousands of highly-skilled and dedicated, sentient people to put together simple things like airplanes and cars.

So how could anyone in his right rational-thinking mind claim that something as complex as this Earth, or for that matter, this Universe, could have come together by chance without some form of sentient intervention? It is highly irrational to believe this, outright absurd. If God doesn't exist then who created the Earth and the Universe? If you insist that the Earth et al came together by the forces of "Mother Nature" or just by "pure chance", then you also agree that no one is running Ford, or Boeing, or Hewlett-Packard, and that all the associated products of these companies form all by themselves without any outside intervention by sentient beings. This is illogical.

Cars and other machines cannot come to exit on their own. But that does not mean that the Earth needs a creator too.

Who created the mountains, the rivers, the rain, the wind or other things that make the Earth a planet? All these phenomena are the products of natural laws. no one sat there to design these mountains the way an engineers designs a car. Everything on this planet and other planets came to existence through gradual evolution and through natural laws. This is also true in the case of the living organisms. I have explained this subject of evolution in detail in the article Chance of Intelligence.

---

19)
You said:

"...i know what galileo knew when he challenged the faith of billions of people who believed for thousands of years that the earth was flat. i know what darwin knew when he defied the common belief of billions of people that thought all living beings were created in six days. and i know what lamark knew when he confronted the universal belief that the earth was 6000 years old. ..."

You are ignorant of some fundamental ground realities:

Those "billions" never ever existed. There was never in any moment in time even one billion people who believed the Earth was flat. Furthermore, Muslims specifically never believed the Earth was flat.

If you are telling me that in the time of Galileo there were no "billions" of people living, you may be right. But certainly since the beginning of human history more than a few billions have lived in this planet who believed that the Earth is flat. But really my intention was not to

provide statistic but to emphasize that truth had nothing to do with the number of people believing or disbelieving in it.

Darwin himself, before his death, denied his own Theory of Evolution and even refuted it most clearly. Either you know this but you hid this fact from the viewers of this site. In case that is so, then you are a liar. And if you did not know this then you are ignorant of some basic things about the life of Darwin.

Sir, you need to read some real scientific books and stop relying in the lies the other Muslims feed you. Where in the world you come up with such ridiculous ideas. Darwin is not an unknown personality. His biography is recorded everywhere. Aren't you embarrassed to lie so obviously that any person can catch you by making a smile search with the name of Darwin? This "universal" belief of the Earth being 6000 years old, how is it that you claim it was "universal" when the Muslims never believed such nor did Islam ever advocate such?

Can you prove this? Show us the verse that says the Earth is five billion years old as it is estimated by scientists.

---

20)
You said:

"... the true muslim was khomeini..."

In fact he was not. He associated partners with God and this took him automatically out of the fold of Islam, if he was ever in it.

This is your opinion. Khomeini himself believed to be the true Muslim and I can testify that he was for I can prove whatever he said and did was inspired by the Quran. Can you show us what he did that was against Islam. I also can prove that the Talibans are the real Muslims by Quran and Hadith, can you show me the reverse using he same sources?

---

21)
You insinuate that:

"...islam's violent ways to expand itself by sword, looting and killing..."

This is most certainly false. Islam expanded so rapidly because of its justice system and simpleness in approaching God. The Caliphs routinely used to dissuade their governors from having too much of the non-muslim population accept Islam in view that the amount of tax revenue generated by non-muslims would decline. Thi is a well known fact. The Christians of the Middle East accepted Islam because they knew it brought peace, stability and justice.

Sometime the apologies of the Muslims to defend Islam incriminates it even more. Here finally you admit that the reason for invading other nations was not to teach them the new message of God but to collect taxes and Islam was indeed nothing but an excuse. If the intention was to teach them the message of God the Caliphs should have been pleased to let people embrace Islam. But if they did so, how they could confiscate all their belongings and enslave them, which obviously was more profitable?

The fact that people accepted Islam is also very clear from your own admission. These people saw that their only chance of survival is to pretend to be Muslims. This acceptance was not out of conviction but was out of necessity it was for survival.

The history of Islam is full of bloody wars all instigated by the Muslims. They killed everyone enslaved the women and children and looted whatever they could. Saying people accepted Islam "because of its justice system and simpleness in approaching God" is an insult to human intelligence and to the victims of Islam. Even today no one is free to make that choice. Can a Muslims recant Islam and walk freely without the fear of being executed or assassinated?

Islam never brought peace and stability to anywhere in the world. It divides the wold in Darul'Islam (house of peace) and Darul'Harb, (house of war) all the non-Muslim world is Darul'harb where Muslims have to make war, kill and convert people to Islam by force. This is obvious today from Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia to Algeria. However Muslims keep fighting with each other constantly where they have no one left to fight with. All the killings between the Shiites, Sunnis, in Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan, Algeria, Iraq/Kuwait are between Muslims.

Islam is a religion of war. It does nothing but to make people hate each other and kill each other.

---

22) You asked:

"...is there one islamic country that is happy, prosperous and civilized?..."

I answer: yes, for hundreds of years, over a thousand years in fact, the Islamic Empires were quite happy, prosperous, and civilized, and cities like Baghdad, Aleppo, Damascus, Qurtoba where were beacons of light and were bustling with prosperity at a time when cities like London and Paris were unknown small villages away in the middle of somehwre, and never mind other cities like Los Angeles or New York which did not exist. And now, we see the only true Islamic country, Afghanistan, is happy under Taliban rule, they are defiant and patient in the face of international sanctions, yet they are still there. Any other Muslim country is ruled by puppets and hypocrites loyal only to Washington D.C. and not God above. The reason why many muslim countries are so unhappy today and in such a state of oppression is because the Muslims have more or less left Islam and adopted other false methods like democracy or communism and so many other "isms". Thus they left Islam and

this allowed their enemies to overcome them. Never ever in history has there ever been a group of Muslims who stuck to Islam yet their enemies still conquered them.

I have to acknowledge that at least in one thing you demonstrated honestly and that is when you admit that the Taleban rule is a true Islamic rule. Many Muslims are embarrassed to admit that and claim that what Taleban do is not the “real Islam”.

I only request the readers to click on this link and see the paradise that the “only Islamic country” has made of Afghanistan and how “happy” are the people. http://afghan.rawa.org/rawa/gallery.html This is what the real Islam means.

As for the so called golden age of Islam, it is important to remember that when Islamic countries were glorious was when the West was sunk in the darkness of religion while there was an unrepeated level of secularism and tolerance among the rulers. This allowed the great minds like ArRazi, In Sina, Ib Rushd, Khayyam and others to be critical of Islam. These luminaries were harassed yet there was enough freedom of thoughts that they could denounce Islam and not be executed. The reason Islam fell is because this freedom was taken away by brutal regimes that tried to implement the real Islam like the Taliban and the Mullahs of Iran. In fact Islam can be used as the index of poverty and barbarity. The more a country is Islamic, the more miserable it is.

Islam is the fortress of Belief that cannot be broken. It has withstood all the plots of its enemies for thousands of years, even when it was in existence before Prophet Muhammad. The arrival of the paracletos Prophet Muhammad only served to massively strengthen this fortress. I advise you to seek shelter within this fortress lest you be overcome by the storm of Disbelief that is raging furiously outside. Otherwise there will be a Day when you may regret not having entered this fortress when you had the chance to do so.

Islam has only survived by executing its critics and disallowing any questioning of its veracity. However, the technology has made it impossible to keep people in the dark. The voices of reason are being heard from every quarter and when reason is the weapon, Islam is awfully weak. Islam is is fast demise and the countdown of its death has already started. Islam has maintained itself by threats and fear. All what Muslims can do is to instill fear of punishment in the people so they do not dare to question it. This tactic still works on those who's brain has not developed to maturity. Children and those adults with the brain capacity of children respond to fear. Adults don't. Intelligent people demand explanation and want answers.

---

23) You said:

"...during the 23 years of his prophetic life, the prophet was catapulted from rags to riches...."

Once again you have provided no proof for this absurd statement, and it only serves to show your unjustified spite and hatred solely for Islam, and not for "all religions" as you claim.

I never claimed to be the promoter of religiosity and the champion of atheism. I never said I spite or hate any religion. All religion in my opinion are man made and superfluous. But I acknowledge many people need to believe in something and I have no intention to belittle that need or decry what they hold dear to their hearts. I fight against Islam and only Islam because Islam advocates hate and destroys lives just as it is doing in your "Islamic paradise" Afghanistan, in Iran, in Philippines, in East Timor, in Indonesia, In Kashmir, In Algeria, In Sudan and in every other Islamic county. I fight against Islam not because it is a false religion but because it promotes hate and kills people.

The Prophet Muhammad was never so poor so as to be called "...from rags..." before or during his Prophethood. When he married the rich Lady Khadijah, he did not marry her for her money, rather it was she who proposed to him in the first place. Before and during his Prophethood he lived a simple and austere life, and any money that would come into his custody would usually be gone within three days to the poor and needy.

That is enough of lies and deceit. Muhammad enriched himself with the stolen booty confiscated first from the merchant caravans and then from massacring the Jews like Banu Quraiza, Banu Nadir, Banu Qainuqa and possessing their properties and belongings and selling them as slaves and sex slaves. This tradition of pillaging was continued after Muhammad died and Umar and other Caliphs after him, devastated nation after nation and to fill their own coffers. When you say he gave away his wealth to the poor and needy, can you tell us where did he earn that wealth? Wasn't it stolen from the non-Muslims? There is a hadith that says in one occasion Ayesha manumitted 40 slaves for expiation after breaking a childish oath. Where did she got that many slaves? How many slaved did she have to manumit 40 of them in one occasion for expiation? Muhammad had a score of wives and concubines, how many slaves all of them had collectively? Muhammad did enrich himself with the blood money. He was a gangster, a murderer and a thief.

Prophet Muhammad was a Prophet of Allah, and he did not desire fame, nor riches, nor power. Had he been aftre riches, fame, or power, he would have easily accepted the proposals put forth by the pagans that they would pay him huge sums of money, or make him their king, or take his command in all their affairs, in exchange that he stop preaching Islam. Prophet Muhammad refused all this and said he only wanted people to believe and obey in One God. Your claim that he was catapulted from rags to riches is false and illogical.

This is a self deception that Muslims love to tell each other. Muhammad was after glory and power. He was a narcissist and nothing satisfies a narcissist more than being the center of attention. Narcissists seek power. They want to dominate the minds and hearts of people and their thirst for power is never ending. Their ambitions are grandiose because they

immensely lack inner security. They are manipulative and shrewd. Because their thirst for domination consumes their being, they are relentless and peruse their ambition single mindedly using every one and every thing a tool to get at what they crave for - power. They use religion, they use god, the use state, race, class or any ideology to influence people and win them over. Muhammad was a sick narcissist not a messenger of God. He went after the ultimate power and that was to pretend to be the representative of a deity that the Arabs already believed in and establish is own unquestioning dominance on their minds, hearts, properties, daughters and even lives. Nothing could have given Muhammad more power than claiming to be a messenger of an invisible god. A perfect plot to get unlimited supply for his narcissistic crave.

There are many more untruths and false perceptions of Islam on your website. We may discuss them publicly on your site if you so want and if it is the will of Allah. I await your response to my challenge.

I have called openly for anyone who wishes to disprove me to come forward. But by judging from the content of your email that you sent me after I responded to the first few questions, I believe now you think that the best way of arguing is to insult.

Ali Sina, if you ever were a muslim, then I invite you to repent unto Allah and return to Islam. Study it with an open and clear rational mind, and do not constrict your mind by judging Islam by today's "modern humanistic" standards, which in reality are corrupt and immoral standards based on the pursuit of the material world and oppression, and not the pursuit of justice and peace.

I am sorry to see how Islam has ruined your rational thinking capacity sir. If I do not judge Islam or any other ideology like thousands of the cults that burgeon every day, with today's modern humanistic standards with what I can measure them?

These "corrupt and immoral" standards of humanism, as you define them, call for:

- Equality of rights between men and women.
- Freedom of belief and expression.
- Equal rights for all human beings irrespective of their religion, race, class, gender or nationality.
- Reason as the source of guidance

These are in your opinion are corrupt and immoral.

Islam teaches:

- Men are "afdal" a degree above women.
- No religion except Islam is accepted.
- Only Muslims are equal. The non believers must be killed, subdued and pay penalty tax.
- The hocus-pocus of Quran is above science and reason even if what it says is sheer stupidity.

Thank you sir for the invitation to return to Islam. I rather follow those "corrupt and immoral" standards of humanism and leave Islam for you.

Wasalam 'ala man'ittaba al huda

And peace unto those follow the right guidance.

Ibn Mardhiyah

The following is what Ibn Mardhiyah wrote in response to my response.

From:	**"Riyaz" isay@lantic.net**

Date:	Thu, 21 Jun 2001

sina

Im sure shaitaan is proud of you.

Even shaitaan believes and knows there is one god ,but he did not like this god .

So both of you are in the same boat!

You want a god that suits your sense of liberal qualities, as if you have a choice of choosing your creator.

Liberal >>do as you please, eat as you like , sleep with who you like etc, as long as you do it in peace....what a sick society , even homosexulism is acceptable,crime is by the way etc etc etc

Muhammed salallahu alaihi wasalam, went to taif to preach ,and was stoned etc,he was bleeding from head to toe. the angels asked him if they sould crush these people bet mountains, he refused saying maybe their children would accept. he was physically abused

yet he did not seek revenge, NOW IS THIS THE SAME PERSON YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT....

You've taken things out of context and presented to the innocent.

What an hypocrite! You accept some traditions as true and deny other traditions that describe the miracles of the prophet etc.

Well you are brainwashed!

You actually believe you originated from a baboon! They say the AIDS virus originated from the baboon

I Pray to ALLAH to inflict on you the disease AIDS

ameen

Ibn Mardhiyah